

REMARKS

The Examiner has restricted the pending claims to four different Inventions: Invention I, encompassing system claims 1-15; Invention II, encompassing device claims 16-23; Invention III, encompassing power supply claims 24-28; and, Invention IV, encompassing method claims 29-34. Applicant strongly but respectfully traverses this restriction requirement.

The Examiner's basis for restricting the claims to the four different Inventions noted above is that "inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are *not disclosed as capable of use together . . .*" Even a cursory review of the four identified Inventions demonstrates that they are actually disclosed as capable of being used together, in contradistinction to the Examiner's statement to the contrary.

The system of claim 1 of Invention I recites an interconnect, an electronic device, and a power supply. For instance, FIG. 2 of the patent application as filed shows such a system 100 having an interconnect 106, an electronic device 102, and a power supply 104.

The device of claim 16 of Invention II recites one or more components to provide a principal functionality, a high-frequency communication circuit, and a high-frequency filter. For instance, FIG. 2 shows that the electronic device 102 can include one or more such principal components 202, a high-frequency communication circuit 206, and an inductor 208, which is a high-frequency filter (see p. 5, ll. 13-15). Thus, the device of Invention II is capable of being used together with the system of Invention I, and is indeed disclosed as such in FIG. 2. Therefore, the restriction between Inventions I and II is improper.

The power supply of claim 24 of Invention III recites a decoder circuit, one or more components to convert AC to DC, and a high-frequency filter. For instance, FIG. 2 shows that the power supply 104 can include a decoder circuit 203, principal components 204 to convert AC to DC (see p. 6, ll. 18-21), and an inductor 226, which is a high-frequency filter (see p. 6, ll. 22-28). Thus, the power supply of Invention III is capable of being used together with the system of Invention I that can include the device of Invention II, and is indeed disclosed as such in

FIG. 2. Therefore, the restrictions between Inventions I and III and between Inventions II and III are improper.

Finally, the method of claim 29 of Invention IV covers the method 800 of FIG. 8. The method 800 is disclosed as being “for transmitting information between the electronic device 102 and the power supply 104 over the interconnect 106” (see p. 10, ll. 6-7). Thus, the method of Invention IV is capable of being used together with the device of Invention II and the power supply of Invention III, which are part of the system of Invention I, and is indeed disclosed as such in the patent application. Therefore, the restrictions between Inventions II and IV, between Inventions III and IV, and between Inventions I and IV are improper.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully but strongly urges the Examiner to withdraw this restriction requirement. Finally, only because Applicant is required to do so, and not because Applicant agrees with the Examiner, Applicant provisionally elects Invention I, encompassing claims 1-15.

Respectfully Submitted,



April 19, 2009  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja  
1474 N Cooper Rd #105-248  
Gilbert, AZ 85233  
tel: 425-427-5094  
fax: 425-563-2098